

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-16.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,204) in view of Lam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,237). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database,” but asserts, “Lam teaches creating a new logical configuration link when connection information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database (see Lam, column 9, lines 1-6).” Applicant notes that the Examiner does not allege Lam et al. as teaching “creating a new logical configuration link when *the local interface and next neighbor information* is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database.” Applicant can find no mention of a “local interface” or “next neighbor information” in the portion of the Lam et al. reference cited by the Examiner.

Moreover, Applicant notes that the Examiner asserts that Hansen teaches “validating the new logical configuration link,” “sending the new logical configuration link to the network device,” and “displaying a graphical representation of the new logical configuration link on a display device,” yet the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach creating a new logical configuration link...” Applicant submits that Hansen’s acknowledged failure to disclose “creating a new logical configuration link...” impairs the Examiner’s argument that Hansen teaches “validating the new logical configuration link,” “sending the new logical configuration link to the network device,” and “displaying a graphical representation of the new logical configuration link on a display device.”

Furthermore, regarding “determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link stored among a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database,” the Examiner cites column 13, lines 40-48, of the Hansen reference, which states, “Returning to step 154, if it is determined that both the origination and destination devices or

entities have available slots, the method proceeds to step 160, where a connection interface is selected for the originating device and on to step 162 where a connection interface is selected for the destination device or entity. At both of these steps, the network administrator may select any one of a list of available connection interfaces overlayed on the network configuration map 106 by the network device configuration tool 10.” Applicant can find no mention of “a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database.” Also, Applicant can find no mention of “determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link....”

Also, while the Examiner appears to assert that “a connection interface is selected for the originating device” (Hansen, column 13, lines 42 and 43) teaches “the local interface” and “a connection interface is selected for the destination device or entity” (Hansen, column 13, lines 44 and 45) teaches “next neighbor information,” Applicant can find no mention of such features in the portion of Hansen (column 12, lines 62-66) cited by the Examiner as allegedly teaching “determining local interface and next neighbor information for the network device.” Thus, Applicant submits that the Examiner’s assertions are mutually inconsistent. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant notes that the Examiner acknowledged that the Hansen reference does not teach “creating a new logical configuration link...,” but asserts that Hansens teaches “wherein the step of creating a new logical configuration link further comprises....” Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Hansen teaches “selecting a link type” in column 13, lines 5-8. However, in column 13, lines 12 and 13, Hansen states, “Specifically, the device has four connection interfaces – two ethernet ports and two serial ports.” Applicant notes that Hansen refers to “connection interfaces,” not “a link type.”

Also, the Examiner cites column 14, lines 26-33, of Hansen as teaching “selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link.” However, column 14, lines 26-33, state, “Thus, in this example, the network administrator would be asked whether the serial port should be configured, the IP address and mask for the port, the IPX network number, whether the port should be configured for frame relay, the type of connector being used for the port, the local data link connection identifier (or “DLCI”), the Committed Information Rate (or “CIR”) and the Excess Information Rate

(or “EIR”) for the port and whether to use compression.” Applicant can find no mention of a “link numbering type” in that portion of the Hansen reference.

Applicant submits, according to the foregoing examples, that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as set forth in claim 2. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner asserts that point-to-IP and point-to-subnet link types are “notoriously well known in the art of computer networks” and attempt to combine such assertion with two of what Hansen specifically refers to as “connection interfaces” to allegedly yield teaching of “selecting the link type from among a group consisting of: point-to-point, point-to-IP, and point-to-subnet.” Applicant notes that the Examiner does not identify any reference that would disclose the recited features. Moreover, Applicant submits that the Examiner’s assertions are far too tenuous to allegedly render obvious the claimed invention as set forth in claim 3. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 3 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach selecting the link numbering type from a group consisting of: a numbered type and an unnumbered type.” However, the Examiner asserts, “the unnumbered link numbering type is notoriously well known in the art of computer networks.” Nonetheless, the Examiner does not identify any reference that would disclose the recited features. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting a link application further comprises the step of: selecting the link application from a group consisting of: Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching,” yet the Examiner asserts such features are “notoriously well known in the art of computer networks,” but does not identify any reference that would disclose the recited features. Moreover, the Examiner does not attempt to reconcile the teachings of column 14, lines 26-33, of Hansen, which the Examiner asserts as teaching “selecting a link application” with respect to claim 2, with the features recited in claim 5. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting a sub layer interface type further comprises the step of: selecting the sub layer interface type from a group consisting of: Packet Over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthernet,” yet the Examiner asserts such features are “notoriously well known in the art of computer networks,” but does not identify any reference that would disclose the recited features. Moreover, the Examiner does not attempt to reconcile the teachings of column 14, lines 26-33, of Hansen, which the Examiner asserts as teaching “selecting a link application” with respect to claim 2, with the features recited in claim 6. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of: modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link database,” but asserts that Lam et al. teach such feature in column 10, lines 8-15. Applicant has already noted the apparent inconsistency of the teachings of Lam et al. with the features recited in claim 1. In light of such apparent inconsistency, Applicant further submits that “update the trail database 50” of Lam et al., as described in column 10, lines 8-15, fails to disclose “modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link database,” as recited in claim 7. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner asserts that Hansen teaches “deleting a logical configuration link the logical link database” in column 13, lines 37-39. Applicant has already noted the apparent failure of Hansen to disclose the features recited in claim 1. In light of such apparent failure, Applicant further submits that “proposed connection is then deleted” of Hansen, as described in column 13, line 37, fails to disclose “deleting a logical configuration link in the logical link database,” as recited in claim 8. For example, Hansen recites a “*proposed* connection,” not “a logical configuration link.” Moreover, Applicant can find no mention in the cited portion of Hansen of “in the logical link database.” Thus, Applicant submits that claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner acknowledges, “Hansen does not teach a logical link database for storing logical configuration links,” but asserts that Lam et al. teach such feature in column 1, lines 56-58. The Examiner further cites column 14, lines 53-61, of Hansen as disclosing “storing local configuration links.” However, Applicant notes the cited portion of Hansen refers to “configuration commands contained therein” (column 14, lines 58 and 59), which appears to be inconsistent with the Examiner’s assertions regarding the “trail database” of Lam et al. (column 1, line 57). Thus, Applicant

submits that there is no suggestion in the prior art to combine the teachings of the cited references so as to allegedly yield the claimed invention as set forth in claim 9. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner cites column 12, lines 36-45, of Hansen as teaching “wherein the display device provides an ability to select a network device having at least one network interface through the graphical user interface form.” Applicant has described an apparent inconsistency in the Examiner’s assertions regarding the cited references with respect to claim 9 and has presented argument as to why the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as set forth in claim 9. Applicant notes that claim 10 depends from claim 9 and asserts that the apparent inconsistency described above also prevents the cited reference from anticipating or rendering obvious the present invention as set forth in claim 10. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 10 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 11-16, the Examiner asserts, “they all recite limitations that are addressed in the rejection for claim 1 and are rejected in the same rationale as they are rejected in claim 1 (see rejection above). To whatever extent claims 11-16 “recite limitations that are addressed in the rejection for claim 1,” Applicant reiterates Applicant’s arguments as set forth above. Thus, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as set forth in claims 11-16. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 11-16 are also in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

01/27/2005



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.
115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 347-9223 (phone)
(512) 347-9224 (fax)